

1 Ira Spiro (sued as Robert Ira Spiro)  
10573 West Pico Blvd. #865  
2 Los Angeles, CA 90064  
Telephone: 310-235-2350  
3 e-mail: ira@spirolawcorp.com  
4 Defendant, a Self-Represented Attorney  
5  
6  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **WESTERN DIVISION**

11 TODD R.G. HILL,

12  
13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.  
15

16 THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
OFFICERS AND AGENTS AND  
17 INDIVIDUALS OF THE PEOPLES  
COLLEGE OF LAW ET AL.,  
18

19 Defendants.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

) **Case No. CV23-1298-CV(BFM)**

) **DEFENDANT SPIRO'S REQUEST**  
) **FOR CLARIFICATION OF**  
) **FOOTNOTE 2, PAGE 5 OF**  
) **MAGISTRATE JUDGE**  
) **MIRCHEFF'S INTERIM REPORT**  
) **& RECOMMENDATION FILED**  
) **2/12/25 (ECF 213)**

) Before  
) **Hon. Cynthia Valenzuela and**  
) **Hon. Magistrate Judge**  
) **Brianna Fuller Mircheff**

1 Defendant Spiro requests clarification of what he believes is a typographical  
2 error in footnote 2, page 5 of the Interim Report and Recommendation of United  
3 States Magistrate Judge Mircheff, filed February 12, 2025 (ECF 213).

4 Footnote 2 presently reads, with emphasis added to the important last  
5 sentence:

6 “Plaintiff’s Request for judicial notice has not been opposed by any of  
7 the Defendants. The Court, however, has read Plaintiff’s Request and  
8 does not anticipate that an Opposition would shed new light on the  
9 analysis. The same is true of Plaintiff’s recently filed Motion that  
10 requests an order granting his prior Motions (ECF 210). **As such, the**  
11 **Court determines that further briefing is necessary to its**  
12 **recommendation relating to Docket Nos. 197 and 210.**

13 It appears to Defendant Spiro that “not” was meant to be added to that last  
14 sentence, so that the footnote would read:

15 “Plaintiff’s Request for judicial notice has not been opposed by any of  
16 the Defendants. The Court, however, has read Plaintiff’s Request and  
17 does not anticipate that an Opposition would shed new light on the  
18 analysis. The same is true of Plaintiff’s recently filed Motion that  
19 requests an order granting his prior Motions (ECF 210). **As such, the**  
20 **Court determines that further briefing is ~~not~~ necessary to its**  
21 **recommendation relating to Docket Nos. 197 and 210.**

22  
23 Dated: February 24 2025

24 *Ira Spiro*

25 Ira Spiro (sued as Robert Ira Spiro)  
26 Defendant, a Self-Represented Attorney  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

I reside in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. My business address is 10573 West Pico Blvd. #865, Los Angeles, CA 90064. On the date stated below I served the document(s) described as **DEFENDANT SPIRO'S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF FOOTNOTE 2, PAGE 5 OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S INTERIM REPORT & RECOMMENDATION FILED 2/12/25 (ECF 213)** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

☒ BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION (EMAIL): On the date set forth below, in Los Angeles, California, I caused to be transmitted the document(s) listed above on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address(s) or e-mail of record in this action.

To Plaintiff Todd R.G. Hill

toddryangregoryhill@gmail.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Los Angeles, California on February 24, 2025.

Ira Spiro  
Type or Print Name

*Ira Spiro*  
Signature